



Attorney Docket no: SEL 216

GP-2675
\$
✓ 41

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Yukio TANAKA

Serial No.: 09/672,738

Filed: September 28, 2000

For: Display Device

Examiner: F. Alphonse

Art Unit: 2675

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

July 29, 2004
(Date of Deposit)

Shannon Wallace

Name of applicant, assignee, or Registered Rep.

Shannon Wallace 7/29/04
Signature Date

RECEIVED

AUG 06 2004

Technology Center 2600

RESPONSE (E)

Applicant has the following response to the Office Action of March 29, 2004, a one month extension being submitted herewith.

Initially, Applicant notes that independent Claims 1, 2 and 23-25 recite a display device comprising:

a first gate driver;

a second gate driver,

wherein each of the first gate driver and the second gate driver comprises at least one TFT formed over a same substrate as a pixel portion or a source driver.

Applicant will now address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Claims Rejections – 35 USC §102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-2 and 23-25 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Matsuhashi. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, in the Office Action, the Examiner contends that “Matsuhashi teaches that the pixel portion (i.e. picture elements), the source driver (note source line 11b (fig. 1)), the first gate driver (e1) and the second gate driver (e2) comprises at least one TFT formed over a same substrate (see figure 1)...”

However, as shown in col. 3, lns. 40-43 of Matsuhashi, e1 and e2 are odd and even number row electrodes, not gate drivers as recited in the claims of the present application. Further, even if an argument can be made that the “row electrode driver” in Fig. 1 of Matsuhashi is a “first gate driver”, Fig. 1 fails to disclose or suggest a second gate driver. Hence, Matsuhashi fails to disclose or suggest at least two gate drivers as recited in the claims of the present application.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are patentable over this reference. Therefore, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

The Examiner also rejects dependent Claims 3-10 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Matsuhashi in view of Akebi. The Examiner further rejects dependent Claims 11-22 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Matsuhashi in view of Yamazaki. These rejections are also traversed.

For at least the reasons described above for the independent claims, these dependent claims are allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee is due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark J. Murphy', with a stylized flourish extending from the end.

Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, Ltd.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500